DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 429 469 HE 031 844

AUTHOR Hinton, Samuel; Downing, Jan E.
TITLE Team Teaching a College Core Foundations Course: Instructors' and Students' Assessments.
PUB DATE 1998-11-00
NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, November 4-6, 1998).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; *College Instruction; *College Students; *Education Courses; Educational Attitudes; Foundations of Education; Higher Education; Interpersonal Relationship; *Student Attitudes; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Education; *Team Teaching; Teamwork
IDENTIFIERS Eastern Kentucky University; *Faculty Attitudes

ABSTRACT

This study examined college instructors' and students' perspectives on the effectiveness of team teaching an undergraduate educational foundations course. A course entitled "School and Society" at Eastern Kentucky University was team-taught by an African American male instructor and a Caucasian female instructor. A total of 10 male and 22 female students, all Caucasian and mainly freshmen and sophomores, completed course evaluation instruments. Specific advantages associated with team teaching included the following: particular talents of instructors were used to their fullest in their specific areas of specialization; the team benefited from reciprocal sharing and critiquing; and instructors complemented each other's method of teaching. Perceived disadvantages that could imperil the process were considered by the team prior to teaching the course and included the following: planning may be time consuming; personal clashes could deter progress; inadequate planning could degenerate into large-group instruction with "turn teaching" rather than team teaching; team members must want to participate and not be forced. Student perspectives on the team teaching of the course were highly positive. (Contains 20 references.) (MDM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 429 469

Team Teaching a College Core Foundations Course: Instructors' and Students' Assessment

Samuel Hinton
and
Jan E. Downing

Eastern Kentucky University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Samuel Hinton

A Paper Presented at the Mid-South Educational Research Association
November 5, 1998
New Orleans, Louisiana

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TEAM TEACHING A COLLEGE CORE FOUNDATIONS COURSE: INSTRUCTORS' AND STUDENTS' ASSESSMENTS

Samuel Hinton and Jan Downing, Eastern
Kentucky University Richmond, Kentucky 40475

Abstract

The study examined college instructors' and students' perspectives on the effectiveness of team teaching an undergraduate educational foundations course titled "School and Society ". The course was team-taught by a male African-American instructor and a female Caucasian instructor. One of the instructors had been a faculty member at this institution for ten years and the other for two. Approximately 10 male and 22 female students, mainly freshmen and sophomores, completed and returned course evaluation instruments. All of the students were Caucasian, one was hearing-impaired and was assisted in class by a note taker and interpreter. The instructors jointly planned and presented the academic content. They also assumed primary responsibility for teaching specified content areas.

Specific advantages associated with team teaching included the following: Particular talents of instructors were used to the fullest in their specific areas of specialization. The team benefited from reciprocal sharing and critiquing. Instructors complimented each other's method of teaching. Perceived disadvantages which could imperil the process were considered by the team prior to teaching the course and include the following: Planning may be time-consuming. Personal clashes could deter progress. Inadequate planning could degenerate to large-group instruction with "turn teaching" rather than team teaching. Team members must want to participate and not be forced. The team embarked on this task with a positive pioneering spirit. Our experience was one of positive results and no major disagreement or dueling. Implications for teacher educators are discussed.

TEAM TEACHING A COLLEGE CORE FOUNDATIONS COURSE: INSTRUCTORS' AND STUDENTS' ASSESSMENTS

Samuel Hinton and Jan Downing

Eastern Kentucky University

INTRODUCTION

The EDF 203 School and Society course at Eastern Kentucky University is a two hour lecture and one laboratory hour undergraduate course in the College of Education. It is one of four restructured core courses designed to keep the teacher education core curriculum in tandem with Kentucky's education reform program (Kentucky Education Reform Act 1990). Two faculty members, an African-American male and a Caucasian-female, were assigned the responsibility of team-teaching the course for the first time in the Spring 1998 semester.

Both members were involved in curriculum development and participated in authoring the handbook for the laboratory and field experiences for use in the course (Acker, Downing, Hinton, and Taylor, 1997). A textbook was adopted and the course planning stage began (Morrison, 1997). Weekly planning sessions were held.

Team teaching can be organized in two general ways. The first is the hierarchical team organization, a line and staff approach in which a leader heads the team of regular teachers. The second is the collegial structure in which there is an informal structure and teachers work together at all common tasks (Johnson, Dupuis, Musial, Hall and Gollnick, 1996). This team agreed on specific responsibilities for specific topics in the syllabus. Presentation formats were discussed and each team member was expected to participate in the teaching process whether the topic fell under his/her responsibility or not. In other words, the team decided not to indulge in turn teaching. A

team member responsible for teaching a particular topic was expected to be "lead teacher" but the other member would fully participate in teaching the lesson.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

First attempts of team teaching surfaced during the 1960's but lasted only briefly. A lack of organizational support, lack of time for planning, and desire to avoid conflict in teaching approaches were blamed for the apparent failure of team teaching (Friedman, 1997). Team teaching was to serve as a method to avoid teacher isolation, empower teachers, and encourage innovation. Hargreaves (1980), however, concluded that teachers actually preferred isolation, defining it as privacy and autonomy.

The literature on team teaching in college is diverse. An interdisciplinary course team taught by instructors from the sociology and drama departments was reported by Alexander and Sullivan (1996). Librarians have used discussion teams to teach information search strategies (Morganti, D., & Buckalew, F., 1991). Team teaching has been used to integrate the teaching of English, history, biology, social science, physical science, and nutrition classes (Messina, S., Simas, R., White, D., 1995). Jurena and Daniels (1997) suggested that a computer science applications course was successfully taught in part, because it was team taught.

Delorenzo et al ., (1997) reported on a program that teamed practicing elementary and secondary school teachers with teacher educators to train new teachers. An action research project combined student teacher preparation and inservice preparation of cooperating teachers (McEwan et al., 1997). The use of team teaching to prepare preservice teachers in science, social studies and mathematics has been proven to be effective at Muskingham College in Ohio (Wilson and Martin, 1998). The training of rural educators in a Distance Learning Project incorporated team teaching

in five different course delivery models (Collins et al., 1996). At the international level, the Scandinavian country of Denmark mandated team teaching as part of inservice training in teacher professional development in 1994 (Birkvard, 1997). Bennin & Lewandowski (1991) stated that team teaching could positively influence student examination scores, interpersonal communication skills, motivation, and attitudes toward team teaching.

One of the first and most important obstacles for a team to overcome is to make the connection between the concept of team teaching and the roles of the teachers (Friedman, 1997). Instructors must be open to the changes that accompany team teaching. These changes may include shared goals, decisions, classroom instruction, responsibility of students, student assessment, problem solving and classroom management (Ripley, 1998).

Summary of Literature Review

The literature on team teaching at the college level is diverse. The team teaching approach has been used in various subject disciplines with successful results. Benefits have been reported for both instructors and students where the process has been used. Team teaching is becoming popular in the preparation of preservice teachers in colleges of education around the United States. At the international level, team teaching inservice training was mandated in 1994 to enable teachers in the Danish "Folkeskole" -primary and lower secondary to change their solitary working style. Our study sought to determine whether our team teaching of an undergraduate school and society course was effective. We collected data using the IDEA, supplementary questions to the IDEA, a team teaching effectiveness questionnaire, and student comment sheets. The feedback we received on each of these instruments were positive and we hope to continue many of the strategies we used in this first class.

We recommend an increase of multi-racial and multi-gender teams at the college level.

Philosophies of education consist of principles that guide professional educators in decision -making (Johnson, et. al, 1996). Our feeling is that there is a need for members in a team teaching group to have compatible educational philosophies. We understand that as we come to manage classroom content, method, and values, we are guided by our personal views on a variety of issues. We teach our students that they should not select one methodology over another. They must understand different philosophies and approaches to teaching and use them responsibly. They must develop a workable classroom philosophy that incorporates the larger role of teaching in a complex society as well as the micro role of relating to students in classroom setting. We believe that our philosophies of education with regard to teaching this class are compatible. Seeing eye to eye on teaching methods and philosophies enabled us to work together collegially and flexibly. We have our separate strengths and proclivities, and we complement each other in our individual styles.

METHOD

We embarked on teaming by individually wondering whether we could work successfully together as an effective team. We did not know how our team might be perceived by students with regard to teaching effectiveness. We were both resolved to be successful in this effort and gave each other reciprocal support and cooperation. At the completion of the course we wanted to validate our perception that we were an effective team. A 25 item likert-type questionnaire was completed by each instructor. The questionnaire was developed by DeBoer & Fiester (1995). The items reflect the critical attributes of highly effective teams. Instructors individually rated each item then discussed the ratings among the team. For any items rated lower than a three, we were to discuss strategies for improvement. As indicated earlier, we perceived ourselves to be a fairly compatible

team and upon comparing our results we realized that neither instructor had rated any item below three.

We also wanted to know what the students thought about our joint effort and teaching performance. Students completed one Individual Development and Educational Assessment (IDEA) course evaluation for both instructors. The IDEA is an instrument developed by the center for Faculty Evaluation and Development, a Division of Continuing Education at Kansas State University. It is used at Eastern Kentucky University as one method of determining teaching effectiveness. All full time faculty in the College of Education are required to complete two IDEA evaluations each semester. Items evaluated included involving students, communicating content and purpose, creating enthusiasm, and preparing examinations. Average item reliability on this instrument are: 10 raters = .69, 20 raters =.81, and 40 raters = .89. Validity coefficients range from .22 to .47. The best criterion of effective teaching is student learning because there is no agreed upon definition of effective teaching (Cashing, 1988).

DATA

The data for this study was collected using the following instruments and techniques: (1.) questionnaire developed by DeBoer & Fiester (1995). This questionnaire was designed specifically for team members to identify strengths and areas of concern in order to assess team effectiveness. (2.) IDEA evaluations used specifically for students to assess teaching effectiveness of instructors. (3.) Four supplementary questions to the IDEA evaluation which were provided by the department of Administration, Counseling and Educational Studies of Eastern Kentucky University. These questions pertained to instructors' demonstration of a positive attitude towards students; systematic and accurate evaluation of student performance, regularity and punctuality in class meetings, and

motivating students to a high degree of interest and achievement in the course. (4.) Students' open comments about our team teaching were solicited at the end of the course.

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

Results of individual questionnaire ratings are located in Table 1. Item responses range from 1-5; 5 indicating the highest score (most positive) and 1 indicating the lowest score (least positive). Team members gave the highest rating of 5 to twenty-three of the twenty-five items on the effective team questionnaire. This was a 92 percent consensus rating. One team member recorded a rating of 4 to three items and the other gave a rating of 4 on one item. These results are overwhelmingly positive and reflect that each teacher perceived the team to be effective in the classroom.

The IDEA Summary Profile for the team in the overall evaluation indicated an 85th percentile ranking. Student progress on all relevant objectives was in the 88th percentile; students indication that they would like to take another class by the team was in the 75th percentile; responses of improvement toward the field (discipline) was in the 73rd percentile. We consider these results to be indicators of our success as an effective team. It is important to note that this was the first time the team had taught togther and the course was a first time offering. The results are tabulated in Table 2.

Student responses to each of the four supplemental questions to the IDEA with regard to the team was over ninety percent positive and are listed in Table 3. Students were also permitted to submit open comments concerning the team-teaching experience. Examples of the types of comments received from students are listed in Table 4.

Overall the comments were very positive. Only two out of 32 students remarked that they preferred traditional teaching (isolation) to team-teaching. We also learned (and somewhat expected) that team teaching would not appeal to all students, however, we felt that the majority of students not only benefitted from the experience but enjoyed it as reflected in their open comments..

IMPLICATIONS FOR COLLEGE TEACHING

Teaming college instructors of different genders and racial origins may be unique. We continue to reflect on the dynamics of planning, process, and delivery of instruction. We are satisfied with the success in teaching a brand new course for the first time together. Our experience, process, and results suggest implications for teacher educators engaged in curriculum reform, course restructuring, and change in their respective institutions. Teaming instructors from different racial and ethnic backgrounds in college level courses is a positive way of role modeling multicultural cooperation to undergraduates. It sends a message to students that there is an institutional commitment to recognizing and appreciating diversity in a college campus. Members of a diverse team also come to appreciate the different perspectives on teaching and learning. They learn from each other and are strengthened in their respect for physiological and cultural differences. They unlearn whatever stereotypical attitudes they might have unconsciously acquired during the course of their lives. Because the literature on college team teaching in teacher education is sparse, we recommend that teacher education institutions expand their efforts towards this end. Our experience indicates that multicultural, multiracial team teaching can be beneficial for both teachers and students. As we embark on our second semester of team teaching we recommend it as worth the while to our college colleagues who may be apprehensive and unenthusiastic about it.

TABLE:1. IDEA Student Evaluation Summary Profile N=32

Item	Percentile
Overall Evaluation	85
Wold Like Instructor(s) Again	75
Improved Attitude Toward Field	73

Note: The IDEA is developed by the center for Faculty Evaluation and Development, a Division of Continuing Education at Kansas State University. These results were taken from the IDEA report for Spring Semester 1998 provided by the Department of Administration, Counseling and Educational Studies, Eastern Kentucky University.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 3 Team-Member Responses to Effective Team Questionnaire N= 32

	Items: As A Team WE	Member (1)Response Lowest				Highest	Member (2)Response Lowest				Highest
1	Celebrate our different personal styles	1	2	3	4	(5)	1	2	3	4	(5)
2	Value inclusiveness. We believe everybody belongs	1	2	3	4	(5)	1	2	3	4	(5)
3	Have commitment to mutual goals	1	2	3	4	(5)	1	2	3	(4)	5
4	Are energetic and enthusiastic about our responsibilities	1	2	3	4	(5)	1	2	3	4	(5)
5	Have a process for planning and problem solving	1	2	3	4	(5)	1	2	3	4	(5)
6	Have clear agreements regarding decision making	1	2	3	4	(5)	1	2	3	4	(5)
7	Listen to and value each other	1	2	3	4	(5)	1	2	3	4	(5)
8	Produce high quality results	1	2	3	4	(5)	1	2	3	4	(5)
9	Demonstrate effective interpersonal skills	1	2	3	4	(5)	1	2	3	4	(5)
10	Obviously care for and have a commitment to each other	1	2	3	4	(5)	1	2	3	4	(5)
11	Take personal responsibility. We do not find fault, we find decisions	1	2	3	4	(5)	1	2	3	4	(5)
12	Are accountable for our decisions and results	1	2	3	4	(5)	1	2	3	4	(5)
13	Have clearly communicated our personal and professional beliefs	1	2	3	4	(5)	1	2	3	(4)	5
14	Have clear, realistic goals for ourselves	1	2	3	4	(5)	1	2	3	4	(5)
15	Have identified and valued our individual talents	1	2	3	4	(5)	1	2	3	4	(5)
16	Encourage and provide constructive feedback	1	2	3	4	(5)	1	2	3	4	(5)
17	Operate in a safe emotional environment	1	2	3	4	(5)	1	2	3	4	(5)
18	Respectfully disagree and argue with dignity	1	2	3	4	(5)	1	2	3	4	(5)
19	Have fun together	1	2	3	4	(5)	1	2	3	4	(5)
20	Take risks to say and do what needs to be said and done	1	2	3	4	(5)	1	2	3	4	(5)
21	Trust each other	1	2	3	4	(5)	1	2	3	4	(5)
22	Are proactive about getting our individual needs met	1	2	3	4	(5)	1	2	3	4	(5)
23	Have effective and efficient communication tools	1	2	3	4	(5)	1	2	3	4	(5)
24	See conflict as an opportunity for learning	1	2	3	4	(5)	1	2	3	4	(5)
25	Have and use strategies for handling serious disagreements	1	2	3	(4)	5	1	2	3	(4)	5

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table:3. Student Responses to the IDEA Supplement N=32)

Item	Never	Sometimes	Occasionally	Frequently	Always	No Response	Negative	Positive	Total	Mean
Faculty member demonstrated a positive attitude towards students.	0%	0%	9%	13%	75%	3%	0%	97%	100%	4.7
Faculty evaluated student performance systematically and accurately.	0%	0%	9%	13%	75%	0%	0%	97%	100%	4.7
Faculty member met classes regularly and punctually.	0%	0%	3%	3%	91%	3%	0%	97%	100%	4.9
Faculty member motivated students to a high level of interest and achievement.	0%	6%	16%	25%	50%	3%	0%	91%	100%	4.2

Note: These additional questions to the IDEA Evaluation were provided by the Department of Administration, Counseling and Educational Studies, Eastern Kentucky University, Richmond Kentucky Spring 1998.

Table 4. Random Selection of Student Comments on Teaching N= 32

Both professors have a wide knowledge of their subject area, and they make coming to the class fun and insightful. I have enjoyed the concept of team teaching. It gives two different views to help everyone better understand the subject matter.
I feel that the instructors worked well together and were able to come up with decisions to better the class. They presented material in an exciting way. One of the best things is they let us work hands-on with the book and discuss different ideas. This was an excellent course.
The two teachers who taught this class worked well together. They communicated well, and neither "took over" the class. They shared the responsibility. This course took up a lot of time, and there was a lot of work to do. Maybe they could have lightened the load a little.
I really enjoyed this class and its teachers! They both seemed organized and excited about teaching! I appreciated the feeling that Dr. Downing and Dr. Hinton care!
Overall, I enjoyed the professors as well as the class.
Team-teaching added variety to the class.
I think that overall the course was well organized and the two instructors make the class very interesting. They taught very well together. What I liked most is that the class was taught in an open environment and they let us say what we wanted when we wanted.
Don't like team-teaching.

Note: Student comments are intended to give feedback to instructors. Students were not given any set of questions to respond to.

REFERENCES

Acker, D., Downing, J., Hinton, S., and Taylor, R. (1998). EDF 203 Schooling and Society: Laboratory and Field experiences Handbook. Department of Administration, Counseling and Educational Studies, Eastern Kentucky University, Richmond, Kentucky.

Alexander, Susan M.; and Sullivan, Katherine (1996). "Teaching In Tandem": Combining Sociology with Theater to Create an Interdisciplinary Classroom. Teaching Sociology, Vol.24, no.4, p.372-77, October.

Bennin, H.E., & Lewandowski, E. M., (1991). Team Teaching Interpersonal Communication

Birkvard, Birgitte. (1997). Teacher Professional Development in Denmark. Phi Delta Kappan, vol.78, no.8, pp.611-14.

Cashing, W. E. (1988). "IDEA Paper NO.20: Student Ratings of Teaching: A Summary of the Research". Center for faculty Evaluation and Development, Division of Continuing Education, Kansas State University.

Collins, Belva C.; et,al. (1996). Using Team Teaching to Deliver Coursework via Distance Learning Technology. Teacher Education and Special education. Vol.19, no.1, pp.49-58.

DeBoer & Fisher, (1995). Working Together: Tools for Collaborative Teaching.

De Lorenzo et al.,(1997). Teacher Preparation: A Team Approach. Paper presented at the Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages(New York, NY, April 3).

Friedman, V. J., (1997). Making Schools Safe for Uncertainty: Teams, Teaching, and School Reform. Teachers College Record.

Jurena, Donna, Phin and Daniels, Ceri, Natalie (1997). Two Heads are Better Than One: Team Teaching in the Information Age. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Nebraska Library Association(Crete, NE, May 23rd).

Johnson, J., Dupuis, V. L., Musial, D., Hall, G. E., and Gollnick, D. M. (1996). Introduction to the Foundations of American Education, Allyn and Bacon, Boston.

Kentucky Education Reform Act: A Citizen's Handbook (1997). Legislative Research Commission, Frankfort, Kentucky.

Lindauer, D. L., (1990). A New Approach to Team Teaching. Journal of Economic

Education. V. 21, N0. 1. Pp. 71-72

Messina, S., Simas, R.J., White, D., (1995). Team Teaching of English Integrated with the Content Area Courses. FISPE Final Evaluation Report.

Morganti, D. J., & Buckalew, F. C., (1991). The Benefits of Team Teaching. Research Strategies. v9 n4 p195-97

Morrison, George, S., (1997). Teaching In America. Allyn and Bacon, Needham Heights, Massachusetts.

Murlock, H.C., (1988). A Rational Format for Team Teaching Introductory Psychology. Teaching of Psychology. V15 n3 p 144-45.

Paul, M. L. & McAndrews, L. J., (1991). Team Teaching the Voices of Central America. College Teaching. v39 n1 p8-10

Ripley, S., (1998). Collaboration Between General and Special Education Teachers. ERIC Clearinghouse on Teaching and Teacher Education, Digest #96-5

Wilson, Vicki A. and Martin, Kaye, M.,(1998). Practicing What We Preach. Paper Presented at the annual meeting of the Associatin of Teacher Educators (Dallas, Texas, February